

**Technical Issues Committee (TIC)**  
**Meeting Notes**  
**24 January 2006**

**Attendees:**

Dr. Karl Longley, Central Valley Water Board  
Claus Suverkropp, Larry Walker and Associates  
Dan Waligora, Department of Fish and Game  
Dania Huggins, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Diana Messina, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Mike Johnson, UC Davis  
Melissa Morris, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Wendy Cohen, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Jim Atherstone, South San Joaquin Irrigation District  
John Swanson, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Matt Reeve, CA. Department of Food and Agriculture  
Bill Thomas, Southern San Joaquin Water Quality Coalition  
Lenwood Hall, University of Maryland  
Margie Lopez Read, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Stephen Clark, Pacific EcoRisk  
Sandy Nurse, Sierra Foothill Laboratory  
Margaret Wong, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Devra Lewis, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board  
John Meek, San Joaquin County and Delta Water Quality Coalition  
Marshall Lee, CA Department of Pesticide Regulation  
Don Weston, UC Berkeley  
Jody Edmonds, URS  
Roberta Firoved, California Rice Commission  
Tina Lunt, Northern California Water Association  
Stephanie Fong, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board  
Dave Ceppos, Center for Collaborative Policy

By phone: Bill McKinney, East San Joaquin Water Quality Coalition

**Opening Remarks:**

Dr. Karl Longley introduced Dave Ceppos from the Center for Collaborative Policy who will be available to facilitate the TIC meetings for the next few meetings for the MRP comment period. Dr. Longley also announced the fact that there would be a joint Board meeting with SWRCB and the Regional Water Boards on 31 January at the CalEPA Building to discuss Salinity issues in the Central Valley. This matter is of great importance to agricultures certainly, as well as to the overall water balance in the State.

**Policy vs Technical**

Wendy Cohen provided a brief comparison of topics that would be considered policy as opposed to those that would be considered technical and could be evaluated by the TIC for recommendations. There were many in the group that felt that many of the policy

issues were determined based on technical input. Therefore, there was not a general agreement that the distinction between policy and technical issues was clear.

### **MRP Objectives**

The objectives behind various aspects of the Tentative MRP for Coalition Groups was presented by staff, including the following:

- Guidelines for Electronic Data Submittal
- Long Term Monitoring Strategy
- Compliance Monitoring
- Minimum Monitoring Requirements Table

Staff presentations on these subjects are provided as attachments to these meeting notes.

There were concerns expressed by some members of the TIC regarding the SWAMP database requirements, which are time-consuming and expensive. It was felt that there needed to be a better understanding of the need for utilizing this database and additional information should be presented or provided.

### **TIC Recommendation Strategy**

The TIC group was reminded that the Tentative MRP for Coalition Groups was the document from which Focus Groups would be developing recommendations.

**Triggers Focus Group.** Stephen Clark made a presentation on behalf of the Triggers Focus Group that identified the issues that the group was still considering. He also posed a recommendation for which the Focus Group had reached consensus regarding trigger for resampling after water column toxicity is indicated. This recommendation is based on a 20% mortality or reduced growth as compared to laboratory control. The recommendation would not alter the approach for submitting an exceedances report, which would remain at any laboratory, indicated statistical difference.

After some questions, it was determined that this recommendation would be brought forth to the TIC again at the next meeting for a decision regarding the communication.

**Laboratory Round Table Focus Group.** Dania Huggins made a presentation on behalf of the Lab Round Table Focus Group regarding achievable PQLs and costs for the analytes listed in the Minimum Monitoring Requirements Table of the Tentative MRP for Coalition Groups. It was an important point that thus far only five laboratories had responded with PQL and Cost information, and it would be useful if Coalition Leads could encourage their laboratories to provide this information. This would provide guidance to allow the Central Valley Water Board staff to make requirements for monitoring reasonable and feasible. The request was made to Coalition Leads to encourage this information from their contract laboratories.

**Sediment Focus Group.** Margie Lopez-Read briefly discussed the fact that the sediment toxicity issues remained to be addressed as well as the water column toxicity issues. In part that needed to include the required response when toxicity was indicated, and

appropriate TIEs for sediment. Don Weston recommended that a flow chart be developed for the sediment toxicity test, just as had been developed for the water column toxicity. The TIC group generally agreed that all of the above was necessary.

**Nutrient Focus Group.** Margie Lopez-Read briefly discussed the fact that the nutrient focus group had some very critical issues to discuss, but that the recommendations to the Tentative MRP did not hinge on the outcome of those discussions. Apart from the issue of PQLs for nutrients (which is being discussed in another focus group), the Nutrient group would be discussing the most appropriate mechanism for evaluating the results of nutrient monitoring, and nutrient water quality assessments as it relates to agriculture. The group generally agreed that the Nutrient Focus Group did not need to meet before the recommendations to the Tentative MRP were concluded.

**Closing Discussion.** The meeting ended with members in agreement that significant effort would need to take place on the part of the Focus Groups to be able to prepare recommendations on the technical aspects of the Tentative MRP. The next meeting will be held on **14 February 2006**, and will be fully facilitated by Dave Ceppos from the Center for Collaborative Policy.

**DRAFT SCHEDULE OF MRP TOPICS  
TECHNICAL ISSUES COMMITTEE MEETINGS  
JANUARY through MARCH 2006**

**MEETING 1 TENTATIVE DATE, January 24, 2006**

**A. PRESENTATION BY WATER BOARD STAFF**

1. Draft Coalition and Water District MRPs – description by staff of rationale for changes made since August Order RB5 2005-0833, such as:
  - Difference between Policy and Technical Issues
  - Compliance monitoring language in draft MRP
  - Guidelines for electronic data submittal
  - Long term monitoring strategy
  - Tentative Order Table and Monitoring Requirements Table
2. Draft Coalition and Water District MRP Table 1 – to be revised by staff (correct errors only) and remaining issues identified, possibly to include:
  - List of method numbers to be more inclusive
  - Performance based methodology or method equivalents
  - Nutrients table renamed to ‘other toxicants’
  - Need for identification of unknown peaks/submission of chromatograms with unknown peaks, etc.
  - Re-evaluate the PQLs that are being requested based on lab capabilities
  - Bacteriological contaminants and beneficial use designation

**B. TENTATIVE FOCUS GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FOLLOWING:**

1. Triggers for resampling and timing of resampling
2. Type of contaminants that require re-sampling
3. Compliance monitoring (2 upstream, timing, etc)

4. Process for factoring in magnitude and set priorities for resampling
5. Other means to identify source (eg: PUR database)
5. Upstream sampling in Irrigation season only (not in storm season)
6. Practicality of a forensic approach and upstream monitoring
7. Trigger to initiate storm event monitoring

**MEETING 2, February 14, 2006**

**TENTATIVE FOCUS GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FOLLOWING:**

1. Electronic data submittal (format and comprehensiveness)
2. Laboratory raw data submittals – what is necessary
3. Timing of submittal for various technical reports (eg: exceedances reports)
4. Response/submittals for unidentified peaks
5. Exceedance Report timelines for field monitoring data
6. Phased approach and long term monitoring strategy
7. Evaluation of contaminants to be monitored – including flow, load, bacteriological contaminants

**MEETING 3, March 14, 2005**

**TENTATIVE FOCUS GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FOLLOWING:**

1. Added language to allow time for dischargers to revise MRP Plans
2. Discussion of options for aerial photos
3. Discussion of signatory responsibilities and penalty of perjury, etc.